Wetting of Water on Graphene

Bijoyendra Bera[1],* Noushine Shahidzadeh[1], Himanshu Mishra [2,3,4], and Daniel Bonn[1]
[1] *Soft Matter Group, Institute of Physics, Science Park 904 1098XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands,*
[2] *King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST),*
[3] *Water Desalination and Reuse Center (WDRC),*
[4] *Biological and Environmental Sciences & Engineering Division (BESE), Thuwal, 23955-6900, Saudi Arabia*
(Dated: December 6, 2016)

The wetting properties of graphene have proven controversial and difficult to assess. The presence of a graphene layer on top of a substrate does not significantly change the wetting properties of the solid substrate, suggesting that a single graphene layer does not affect the adhesion between the wetting phase and the substrate. However, wetting experiments of water on graphene show contact angles that imply a large amount of adhesion. Here, we investigate the wetting of graphene by measuring the mass of water vapor adsorbing to graphene flakes of different thickness at different relative humidities. Our experiments unambiguously show that the thinnest of graphene flakes do not adsorb water, from which it follows that the contact angle of water on these flakes is $\sim 180^o$. Thicker flakes of graphene nanopowder, on the other hand, do adsorb water. A calculation of the van der Waals (vdW) interactions that dominate the adsorption in this system confirms that the adhesive interactions between a single atomic layer of graphene and water are so weak that graphene is superhydrophobic. The observations are confirmed in an independent experiment on graphene-coated water droplets that shows that it is impossible to make liquid 'marbles' with molecularly thin graphene.

arXiv:1611.09093v2 [cond-mat.soft] 30 Nov 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Atomically thin layers of graphene (sp^2 hybridized carbon atoms in a hexagonal honeycomb array) exhibit an exceptionally rich range of mechanical and electronic properties such as high mechanical strength, impenetrability, chemical stability, optical transparency, and high electrical and thermal conductivity [1, 2]. As a result, graphene has become one of the most active areas of scientific research in the last decade [3–5]. Among many others, potential applications of graphene in water desalination [6], electrochemistry [7] and catalysis [8] are being explored extensively. However, a clear understanding of the physical interactions between graphene and water has remained elusive. Recent experiments have shown that the contact-angle of water on graphene-coated substrates and bare substrates are almost identical, which suggests that graphene is wetting-transparent [9]. Substrate interactions play an important role in these experiments. To avoid these, and assess the wetting properties of water on graphene only, we use an entirely different experimental approach, involving only graphene and no substrates. We measure the water adsorption from water vapor on graphene nanopowders consisting of nanoflakes of different thicknesses. For molecularly thin few layers graphene, we find that that the contact angle of water is indistinguishable from 180^o; we show that this is indeed due to the adhesive interactions from a molecular layer being vanishingly small.

The 'wetting transparency' of graphene was first reported by Rafiee *et al.* [9] based on static contact angle measurements with water drops on graphene-coated Si and Au substrates. On Si and Au, the contact angle of a water drop is shown to be $\sim 33^o$ and $\sim 77^o$, respectively, both with and without a graphene layer present on the substrate. They argued that the atomically thin layer of graphene is not relevant for the adhesive van der Waals interaction. Subsequently, a debate ensued regarding the nature of the interactions. Calculations of the van der Waals and short range repulsive forces suggest that a graphene layer would alter the wetting properties on superhydrophilic and a superhydrophobic substrates [10]. Contact angle measurements by Raj *et al.*, [11] on the other hand, demonstrated that contact angles are independent of the number of graphene layers on a glass or silicon oxide substrate. They also pointed out the influence of the substrate material in estimating the wettability of graphene coated substrates. The possible role of contamination has also been extensively discussed [12, 13].

In all the experiments and simulations mentioned above, the wetting phase water is invariably introduced in the form of a sessile drop [14]. However, there is another way of assessing the wetting properties of a liquid on a given substrate [15]; in this work, we measure the thickness of adsorbed water films from the vapor phase as the relative humidity (RH) is gradually increased. If the adhesive interactions are strong, a large amount of water will condense onto the substrate. The quantity of adsorbed water is given by the tradeoff between the energy cost of condensing water from an unsaturated vapor and the adhesive energy gain of having a water film at the surface [16]. We therefore study the adsorption

* b.bera@uva.nl

of water films onto collections of graphene flakes with a large surface area; this allows us to establish the wetting properties of water on graphene alone. The presence of a very large surface area also minimizes the effects of surface contamination. The flakes are of different thicknesses, so we can measure the adsorption properties as a function of the number of graphene layers without relying on a non-graphene solid substrate.

II. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

Graphene nanopowders (Graphene Supermarket, NY, USA) of three different flake thicknesses are used. We obtained the number of graphene layers (N) present in the nanopowder sample from Raman spectroscopy data (details in Supplementary Information) following the relation [17] ω_G=1581.6+$\frac{11}{(1+N)^{1.6}}$, where ω_G is the wavenumber corresponding to the G-peak. The calculation yields N∼1, N∼ 4-5 and N∼25, respectively, for the three nanopowder samples. According to definition, a single graphene layer is ∼ 0.35 nm thick. However, instead of dealing with the absolute thickness values, we focus upon the relative increase in the number of graphene layers in our nanopowder samples which will subsequently be the basis of our interpretation. The specific surface areas (measured by Brunauer-Emmett-Teller or BET method by the supplier) of N∼1, N∼ 4-5 and N∼25 thick graphene nanopowder samples are 500 m^2/g, 100 m^2/g and 20 m^2/g, respectively.

Figure 1 shows the amount of water m adsorbed by graphene which clearly varies with the thickness of the flakes (i.e., the number of graphene layers in the experiment) as the relative humidity (RH) is changed. The layer of nanopowder with the thinnest flake size (N∼1) does not adsorb any water even at the highest RH. In contrast, the nanopowder consisting of 4-5 layers of graphene adsorbs considerable amount of water, and the 25 layer thick flakes even more. We verified that the moisture adsorption trends show no hysteresis by comparing the results for increasing RH (from 5% to 90%) with decreasing RH (from 90% to 5%); this excludes capillary condensation between the graphene nanopowder flakes [15, 16].

In our experiments, we measure the adsorbed mass of water m; knowing the specific surface area a and the amount of graphene nanopowder m_0, we can deduce the layer thickness of the film $h = \frac{m}{m_0\ a\ \rho}$, with ρ the density of water (Fig.1).

III. VAN DER WAALS FORCES

In order to understand the mass adsorption characteristics, we start with the fact that the adhesive interaction between the water and the graphene is due to the van



FIG. 1. Adsorbed water w.r.t RH for graphene nanopowder of various flake thicknesses (as provided by the manufacturer): 1.6 nm (red), 8 nm (blue) and 50 nm (black), whose proportion (1:5:31) agrees rather well with our number of graphene layers calculation from Raman data (1:5:25). The amount of water adsorbed by graphene nanopowder is measured on an automated balance with a precision of 0.0001 g placed in a controlled climatic chamber[18] of variable RH at a fixed temperature while eliminating any scope of contamination. The various shape of symbols (square, circle and triangle) signify separate representative experiments. Continuous lines depict predicted moisture adsorption for graphene nanopowders based on various flake thickness values as provided by the manufacturer: 1.6 nm (red), 8 nm (blue) and 50 nm (black). In addition, the adsorbed film thickness h in case of 50 nm thick graphene nanopowder is also shown with the crossed open symbols.

der Waals forces. These can be calculated and compared with our adsorption experiments. Our system consists of a few molecular layers thick graphene (Fig.2a); in this case the adhesion force per unit area can be written as [19]:



FIG. 2. (A) Schematic of graphene wetting represented as an adsorbed precursor film of thickness h. (B) Schematic of graphene's wetting transparency in air: the van der Waals interactions between graphene and water molecules are so much smaller than those between the water molecules themselves that the equilibrium contact angle is ≈ 180^o.

$$\Pi_{vdw}(h) = -\frac{1}{6\pi}\frac{A_{132}}{h^3} - \frac{1}{6\pi}\frac{A_{12/31}}{(h+t)^3} \qquad (1)$$

where, A_{132} is the Hamaker constant with interactions between the interfaces 12 (air-graphene) and 32 (water-graphene) in consideration, $A_{12/31}$ is that for interfaces 12 (air-graphene) and 31 (air-water), t is the flake thickness of graphene nanopowder and h, the adsorbed water

film thickness. The equilibrium film thickness h_{eq} follows from the equilibrium between the adhesion forces and the energy required for condensation of water from the vapor follows as [15, 19]:

$$\Pi(h_{eq}) = \Pi_{vdw} + \frac{\Delta\mu}{v_{w,molar}} = 0 \quad (2)$$

where, $\Delta\mu$=RT $\ln(\frac{p}{p_{sat}})$=RT $\ln(\frac{RH}{100})$ is the change in the chemical potential brought forward by the change of RH in the surrounding and $v_{w,molar}$ is the molar volume of water at room temperature.

The Hamaker constant $A_{12/31}$ can be simply represented as $A_{12/31}=\sqrt{A_{121}A_{313}}$. Using Lifshitz theory [19], the Hamaker constants have been calculated from the refractive indices and the dielectric constants. The details of the calculation are provided in the Supplementary Information. Since we already know the adsorbed aqueous film thickness h from the adsorbed mass m, Eq.1 and 2 can be solved for $\Delta\mu$. The trend of adsorbed mass w.r.t. RH agrees quite well with the experiments (Fig.1). The calculated values overestimates the adsrobed mass at low RH which can be attributed to the fact that the calculation of the Hamaker constants is not straightforward, since one of our phases is water with a high dielectric constant and many optical absorption bands [20]. In addition to that, the electronic properties of graphene change significantly in the first few layers. Thus, even the thinnest nanopowder sample is quite heterogeneous in its morphology and dielectric properties.

These results show that for the molecularly thin graphene, the mass of adsorbed water and hence the equilibrium film thickness is indistinguishable from zero, even *at* coexistence i.e., at 100% relative humidity. In agreement with the experimental and calculated water adsorption data, the van der Waals adhesive interactions between a water drop and a single graphene layer are extremely weak, leading to a contact angle $\sim 180^o$. The contact angle θ of the drop on the solid phase can be calculated directly from the disjoining pressure $\Pi(h)$; the spreading parameter S can be written as:

$$S = \int_{h_{eq}}^{\infty} \Pi(h) dh \quad (3)$$

i.e., by calculating the work necessary against the van der Waals forces to go from an infinitely thick film to a finite thickness h_{eq}.[21] Young's equation, then gives the contact angle as:

$$\cos\theta = 1 + \frac{S}{\gamma_{lv}} \quad (4)$$

The calculation then leads to θ=179.3^o, 163.2^o and 139.7^o ($\pm 2^o$), for the three graphene flake thicknesses of N$\sim$1, N$\sim$ 4-5 and N$\sim$25; respectively: Indeed the molecularly thin graphene is superhydrophobic.



FIG. 3. Graphene powders of various flake thickness encapsulating water droplets; (A) 1.6 nm (B) 8 nm (C) 50 nm. The scale bars in A, B and C each represents a length of 2 mm.

IV. TEST FOR LIQUID MARBLES

An independent test of the observation that the contact angle of water on molecularly thin graphene is indistinguishable from 180^o can be obtained by attempting to adsorb the graphene flakes onto a water drop. If the adhesive interaction is strong enough, the flakes will adhere to the liquid drop coating the whole surface in the process. This phenomenon is well known for hydrophobic particles adsorbing onto water drops; this leads to the formation of 'liquid marbles', or pearls, which are liquid drops encapsulated by a hydrophobic powder. This results in a powder-coated drop that rolls very easily over any solid substrate and the properties of such drops have been investigated in detail [22, 23]. Theoretically, it is firmly established that particles of a material with a contact angle smaller than 180^o should adsorb onto the surface of a liquid drop to form liquid marbles since the system gains the adhesion energy between the powder and the drop [24]. In our 'liquid graphene marble' experiments, the different graphene nanopowders are placed onto flat polystyrene substrates (experimental details in Supplementary Information). Putting a water droplet (volume 5 μl) onto the powder indeed leads to the spontaneous formation of a liquid marble for the intermediate thickness (8 nm) flakes. As expected, the resulting drop has a very large contact angle and rolls easily over the surface. For the thickest flakes (50 nm), the powder covers the surface but a small part of the powder even intrudes into the water: the powder is no longer sufficiently hydrophobic to form perfect marbles, and a drop with a finite contact angle ensues. On the contrary, the molecularly thin flakes (1.6 nm) *are not even adsorbed onto the surface* implying that there is no measurable adhesive interaction between the graphene and the water. All these observations are in line with the mass measurements above, and confirm that the contact angle of water on molecularly thin graphene is $\sim 180^o$.

These findings rationalize previous observations on the wetting properties and wetting transparency of graphene. The extreme thinness combined with its wetting transparency makes graphene an ideal coating material in electronics, but the insight in the fundamental process has been clouded with possibilities of contamination or substrate interaction. Our results are

independent of a specific substrate. We treat graphene nanopowder as a porous medium, where the amount of water adsorbed follows a BET type of adsorption isotherm and thus only depends on the flake thickness of the solid phase. Wetting transparency of few layers thin graphene is conclusively shown through our adsorption experiments, and is further supported by the calculation of van der Waals type of interactions in our system. We thus close the ongoing debate on wetting transparency of graphene and thereby open the way for improved use of graphene in contact with water, such as coating, catalytic or electrochemical systems.

[1] C. Gomez-Navarro, J. C. Meyer, R. S. Sundaram, A. Chuvilin, S. Kurasch, M. Burghard, K. Kern, and U. Kaiser, Nano Letters **10**, 1144 (2010).

[2] C.-J. Shih, M. S. Strano, and D. Blankschtein, Nat Mater **12**, 866 (2013).

[3] K. S. Novoselov, A. K. Geim, S. V. Morozov, D. Jiang, Y. Zhang, S. V. Dubonos, I. V. Grigorieva, and A. A. Firsov, Science **306**, 666 (2004).

[4] A. K. Geim, Science **324**, 1530 (2009).

[5] A. K. Geim and K. S. Novoselov, Nat Mater **6**, 183 (2007).

[6] A. H. Castro Neto, F. Guinea, N. M. R. Peres, K. S. Novoselov, and A. K. Geim, Reviews of Modern Physics **81**, 109 (2009).

[7] S. D. Mildred, Physica Scripta **2012**, 014002 (2012).

[8] O. Chuhei and N. Ayato, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **9**, 1 (1997).

[9] J. Rafiee, X. Mi, H. Gullapalli, A. V. Thomas, F. Yavari, Y. Shi, P. M. Ajayan, and N. A. Koratkar, Nat Mater **11**, 217 (2012).

[10] C.-J. Shih, Q. H. Wang, S. Lin, K.-C. Park, Z. Jin, M. S. Strano, and D. Blankschtein, Physical Review Letters **109**, 176101 (2012).

[11] R. Raj, S. C. Maroo, and E. N. Wang, Nano Letters **13**, 1509 (2013).

[12] Z. Li, Y. Wang, A. Kozbial, G. Shenoy, F. Zhou, R. McGinley, P. Ireland, B. Morganstein, A. Kunkel, S. P. Surwade, L. Li, and H. Liu, Nat Mater **12**, 925 (2013).

[13] K. Xu and J. R. Heath, Nat Mater **12**, 872 (2013).

[14] T. Ondarcuhu, V. Thomas, M. Nunez, E. Dujardin, A. Rahman, C. T. Black, and A. Checco, Scientific Reports **6**, 24237 (2016).

[15] D. Bonn, J. Eggers, J. Indekeu, J. Meunier, and E. Rolley, Reviews of Modern Physics **81**, 739 (2009).

[16] D. Bonn and D. Ross, Reports on Progress in Physics **64**, 1085 (2001).

[17] H. Wang, Y. Wang, X. Cao, M. Feng, and G. Lan, Journal of Raman Spectroscopy **40**, 1791 (2009).

[18] J. Desarnaud, D. Bonn, and N. Shahidzadeh, Scientific Reports **6**, 30856 (2016).

[19] J. Israelachvili, *Intermolecular and Surface Forces: Revised Third Edition* (Elsevier Science, 2011).

[20] D. Bonn, E. Bertrand, N. Shahidzadeh, K. Ragil, H. T. Dobbs, A. I. Posazhennikova, D. Broseta, J. Meunier, and J. O. Indekeu, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **13**, 4903 (2001).

[21] E. Bertrand, H. Dobbs, D. Broseta, J. Indekeu, D. Bonn, and J. Meunier, Physical Review Letters **85**, 1282 (2000).

[22] P. Aussillous and D. Quere, Nature **411**, 924 (2001).

[23] T. Supakar, M. Moradiafrapoli, G. F. Christopher, and J. O. Marston, Journal of Colloid and Interface Science **468**, 10 (2016).

[24] G. McHale and M. I. Newton, Soft Matter **11**, 2530 (2015).